

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-6691

JOHN LEE CAMERON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

GARY MAYNARD; CHARLES CONDON, Attorney General
of the State of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Anderson. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge.
(CA-02-1247-8-24BI)

Submitted: August 28, 2003

Decided: September 4, 2003

Before NIEMEYER and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Lee Cameron, Appellant Pro Se. Derrick K. McFarland, OFFICE OF
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

John Lee Cameron seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2254 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U. S. 322, ___, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1039 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Cameron has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED